THE
# Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 16, No. 5 (Broadcast 754) February 2, 1970 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

## MAKING FRIENDS OF ENEMIES, ENEMIES OF FRIENDS

On all major issues (such as forced housing, urban renewal, foreign aid), Spiro Agnew was a Rockefeller-type liberal before being nominated for Vice President. There is no evidence that his liberalism on these issues has been diluted. Yet, he suddenly came forward as the conservative spokesman of the Nixon administration.

Whatever the reasons behind them, Agnew's blast at pro-communist anti-war demonstrators as "effete snobs" and his criticism of tv network commentators as self-appointed controllers and distorters of the news were certainly pleasing to all conservatives.

Many commentators have noted that these badly-needed and accurate Agnew attacks on the far left have brought some disenchanted conservatives back into the Nixon fold.

That having been accomplished, Agnew then made a trip to Asia and spoke out in support of a liberal policy that conservatives, for 20 years have condemned as pro-communist and harmful to U. S. interests.

On January 2, 1970, Vice President Agnew, supporting Nixon's policy of trying to establish friendly relations with communist China, said that the 800 million people of mainland China cannot be ignored, and that the United States must develop "a meaningful dialogue" with the Chinese communists.[1]

Almost 37 years of experience with communists has taught everyone who does not wish to ignore the facts that we cannot have any "dialogue" whatever with communist governments without aiding the cause of communism, impairing our own national interest. Communists never enter discussions with the idea of negotiating, and they never negotiate. They make outrageous demands that they do not expect us to meet. After their demands and our resistance have produced all the propaganda that communists deem productive for them, they sometimes make trifling moderations of their demands.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1970. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We often yield at that point, giving the communists all they had ever expected, getting nothing for ourselves. Then our leaders congratulate themselves for having eased international tensions, and praise the communists for moving closer toward world amity and universal peace.[2]

The significance of Agnew's statement about our relations with communist China is that *Agnew* made it.

With *Agnew* — now universally acclaimed as *the* conservative hardliner on the national scene — advocating negotiations and friendly relations with communist China, conservative opposition to such a policy is collapsing.

All of this seems to bear out the prophecy of liberal commentators who consoled themselves and fellow liberals immediately after the election of Richard Nixon, by saying that Nixon, because of his "conservative image," could and would get more support for genuinely liberal policies (like recognition of Red China) than Hubert Humphrey (universally recognized as an authentic socialist-liberal) could ever have got.

On January 5, 1970, Vice President Agnew made a statement in Thailand that refurbished his image as a conservative hardliner. He said:

**"Some people back home are so anxious to make friends of our enemies that they even seem ready to make enemies of our friends."[3]**

If we have any friends in Asia, they are anti-communist nations that fear and hate communist China. It seems apparent, therefore, that making friends of our enemies and enemies of our friends is precisely what Agnew and Nixon are doing by moving toward recognition of communist China.

## CHROME, COMMUNISTS, RHODESIA

Chromium is a metal indispensable in the manufacture of goods essential to the defense and the economy of the United States. There are only two major sources of chromium ore in the world: Rhodesia and the Soviet Union.[4] Herein lies a story which illustrates clearly how our government, under "liberal" leadership, operates to help our enemies, hurt our friends, and aids international communism at the cost of America's own vital interests.

In the 1950's, communists initiated a program to conquer Africa for themselves, by driving Europeans out, then installing dictatorships by native Africans under communist control. Supported by the United States government, and by the UN, the communist program quickly eliminated white rule in all of Africa north of the Zambezi River.[5]

As white rule vanished, barbarism and tribal warfare returned to black-ruled Africa. Only in the temperate zones of southern Africa did there remain bastions of white Christian civilization. On the southern tip of the continent is the Republic of South Africa. Portugal still governs in Mozambique and Angola; and, to the north of South Africa is Rhodesia, which, for more than 40 years (1923-1965) was a self-governing colony of the British Empire.[5]

There are about 250 thousand whites, four million blacks in Rhodesia. Whites built the nation. Most of the Negroes came later, to enjoy the benefits of the white man's civilization. About half of all blacks are foreigners who infiltrated Rhodesia, illegally, from surrounding Negro nations. Three-fourths of all Negroes in Rhodesia live in tribal areas, ruled by tribal chiefs.[5]

Rhodesia is governed by a parliament, elected by qualified white and Negro voters. Negroes who meet standards of voter qualification have the same voting privileges as whites who meet the same standards. When enough Negroes qualify to vote, they can control the government. Meanwhile, most voters are white; and whites control the government.[5]

Watching the raging inferno of violence spread throughout black Africa as white rule was eliminated, Rhodesians realized they could save their nation only if they were free of British control.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Between 1956 and 1965, Great Britain granted independence to 14 African territories with primitive economies and cultures and with little or no experience in self government, and had promised independence to Rhodesia, but, at the last moment, refused to grant independence because Rhodesia was ruled by a white minority.[5]

On November 11, 1965, Rhodesia unilaterally declared her independence from Great Britain — the first and only British colony ever to take such action since 13 American colonies declared their independence in 1776. Rhodesia — always friendly to the United States — patterned her Declaration of Independence on ours.[5]

Britain declared Rhodesia's action an illegal rebellion, and imposed economic sanctions. The Johnson administration denounced the Ian Smith government as a "rebel regime," and promised to support Britain's sanctions.[5]

The UN recommended that all member nations stop trade with Rhodesia. On March 18, 1966, President Johnson, invoking provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, embargoed exports of most American goods to the beleagured country.[5]

On December 16, 1966, the UN Security Council ordered all member nations to impose economic sanctions against Rhodesia. On January 5, 1967, President Johnson obeyed by issuing an executive order which could impose penalties of a ten-year prison sentence or a $10,000 fine on any American who trades with Rhodesia.[4]

Five days later — January 10, 1967, the opening day of a new Congress—U. S. Representative James B. Utt (California Republican) introduced a joint resolution to nullify Johnson's executive order and also to nullify the order of March 18, 1966, which embargoed exports to Rhodesia.[5]

Congress did not enact Utt's resolution. American businesses, therefore, were forced to buy chromium ore from the Soviet Union.

Since then, the Soviets have raised the price 50 percent. They also require us to buy a ton of junk ore for every ton of high-quality ore they sell us.[4]

The American-Soviet trade agreement, under which Americans buy chromium ore from the Soviet Union, expires in 1970. Last year, U. S. Representative Albert Watson (South Carolina Republican) urged the Nixon administration to terminate our economic sanctions against Rhodesia, so that American business firms could start negotiations for the purchase of chromium ore from Rhodesia — before expiration of the chromium-purchasing agreement with the Soviet Union. Watson introduced a resolution to put Congress on record as opposing the trade sanctions against Rhodesia.

Watson said:

**"It is solely for the consideration of the United Nations that the U. S. has been pursuing this disastrous course against our own best interest and against our ally, one of the few real friends we have in the world — Rhodesia."**[4]

Though the Watson resolution of 1969 was much milder than the Utt resolution of 1967, it suffered the same fate: the administration opposed it, and Congress refused to pass it.

But it is not too late. Congress need not ask President Nixon to end sanctions against Rhodesia. Congress has constitutional authority to end them. The people should let Congress know they want this done. Remember, most House Members and one-third of all Senators are up for re-election this year.

## HYPOCRISY

**"We are not promiscuous. We love sincerely. We don't think marriage is important, or that what we are doing is wrong so long as we aren't hurting anyone. Our parents never lived by the moral code they preach. The world never has. We love without their hypocrisy."**

That, in essence, was the defense of the "new morality" recently given by an attractive college



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

girl in a television interview. Who can deny her assertion that adultry and hypocrisy are as old as man himself? No one! Then, is there justification for her attitude, which parades under the banner of "true love" and finds virtue in its lack of "hypocrisy"? If the "new morality" cannot be justified, how can the "back street" morality of older generations be defended without defending hypocrisy itself? Possibly it cannot be, or should not be attempted.

But let's consider this world without *hypocrisy*, which literally means: *a false assumption of virtue; a simulation of goodness; a practice of feigning to be what one is not.*

As old as sin itself is man's conscious effort to be something better than he really is. The soul of man reaches for a perfection which he never attains. Through the ages, he has compromised with himself in various ways; and, all too often, he has settled for the illusion or image of the virtue which he has not attained but on which he, and the society in which he lives, place value. Hence, he conceals his sins when possible, and soothes his conscience in many ways. He becomes an active hypocrite; but, oddly enough, society often profits from his deception. Charities and churches, universities and hospitals, arts and orphans — all have benefitted from the bounty of hypocrites.

Unless he is depraved, man instinctively values the opinion of his fellow man. This accounts for the pretense of morality on the part of many who are not moral. Though it is a poor substitute for real virtue, lip service to morality is better than no service at all.

The fact that hypocrisy exists today indicates that, while man has fallen far short of his moral and spiritual goal, he is still reaching.

The "new morality" is not new. It is as old as sin and hypocrisy. It has been conspicuous in the crumbling of every great civilization which abandoned its moral traditions — and pretenses. It is, and always has been, an escape from responsibility; it is an excuse for failure; it is a license for unrestrained self-indulgence.

And it is, therefore, the greatest hypocrisy of all.

## REMINDER

Our special gift-subscription rates are in effect until February 28, 1970: two or more 1-year subscriptions, $9.00 each; two or more 6-month subscriptions, $5.50 each; 3-month subscriptions, $3.00 each.

## 1969 INDEX

A comprehensive index of all issues of this *Report* for the year 1969 is now available. It is especially useful to those who keep a complete file of the *Report* for future reference.

Price: $1.50.

Indexes for all previous years are sold out, no longer available.

### FOOTNOTES

(1) New York Times News Service, Jan. 3, 1970

(2) *Dan Smoot Report*, Feb. 20, 1967

(3) Associated Press, Jan. 5, 1970

(4) Press release by U. S. Representative Albert Watson, Nov. 19, 1969

(5) Footnotes to *Dan Smoot Report*, Jan. 11, 1965; Sept. 13, 1965; Jan. 10, 1966; Feb. 27, 1967; Mar. 6, 1967


**Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report**

6 mos. $6.00 — **1 YR. $10.00** — 2 yrs. $18.00

**THE DAN SMOOT REPORT**
**BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214**
**Telephone: TAylor 1-2303**

**Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.**
**REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 copy | $ .25 | 100 copies | $ 6.50 |
| 10 copies | 1.00 | 200 copies | 12.00 |
| 25 copies | 2.00 | 500 copies | 28.00 |
| 50 copies | 3.50 | 1000 copies | 50.00 |

**Texans Add 4¼% for Sales Tax**
**(Add 50c for special-handling postage)**




PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED